THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS JOURNALS

The Delphic Maxim "Know Yourself" in the Greek Magical Papyri

Author(s): Hans Dieter Betz

Source: *History of Religions*, Nov., 1981, Vol. 21, No. 2 (Nov., 1981), pp. 156-171

Published by: The University of Chicago Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/1062222

REFERENCES
Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:
https://www.jstor.org/stable/1062222?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents
You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *History of Religions*

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Hans Dieter Betz

THE DELPHIC MAXIM "KNOW YOURSELF" IN THE GREEK MAGICAL PAPYRI

Habent sua fata sententiae. This modification of the ancient proverb provides an apt characterization of the long-winding history of the Delphic maxim "Know yourself" and its interpretations. In his recent monumental work, Pierre Courcelle[1] has gathered and ordered the sources documenting that history from Socrates to Saint Bernard of Clairvaux. Taking into account many subsidiary rivers of the great stream of tradition, Courcelle also mentions two passages from the *Papyri Graecae Magicae*[2] in a footnote.[3] There are, however, other passages to be named, and on the whole the influences of the Delphic maxim in the *PGM* are more complex than Courcelle's footnote

[1] Pierre Courcelle, *Connais-toi toi-même; de Socrate à Saint Bernard*, 3 vols. (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1974–75). See also my article, Hans Dieter Betz, "The Delphic Maxim ΓΝΩΘΙ ΣΑΤΤΟΝ in Hermetic Interpretation," *Harvard Theological Review* 63 (1970): 465–84; idem, *Plutarch's Theological Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1975), pp. 85 ff.; idem, *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), pp. 55, 221, 375, 379 ff.

[2] The edition quoted in this article is by Karl Preisendanz, *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri*, 2d ed., 2 vols., ed. Albert Henrichs (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1973–74). The papyri are hereafter cited as *PGM* with references to numbers and lines.

[3] Courcelle, 1:76, n. 39, referring to *PGM* VII.335 and VII.505.

© 1981 by The University of Chicago. 0018-2710/82/2102-0003$01.00

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

would lead one to believe. These influences do not offer themselves at first sight but become apparent only after the texts have been brought into contact with philosophical and religious thought outside the *PGM*.

THE PROBLEM

Why the *PGM* should have become interested in the Delphic maxim is far from self-evident. The maxim is never quoted verbatim, but interpretations of the maxim in the philosophical tradition seem to have attracted the attention of the magicians. It is at the point of these interpretations that influences of the maxim in the *PGM* can be identified.

THE PRESUPPOSITIONS

As Courcelle has so clearly demonstrated, the history of the interpretation of the Delphic precept can be traced back primarily to Socrates and Plato. Most influential was Socrates' discussion of the meaning of the maxim in Plato's *Alcibiades Maior*.[4]

When in the final section Plato has Socrates give his interpretation of the precept (128E–135E),[5] he raises the question of what the self is that we are advised to know. Since that self must be what the human person (*ἄνθρωπος*) as a whole is in essence, it must be different from the body: "So the human being is an entity different from his own body."[6] The question is, of course, "Then what is the human being?"[7] Socrates answers: "The soul is the human being."[8] Consequently, knowledge of the self is knowledge of the soul: "Then the god who instructs us to know ourselves orders us to know the soul."[9] This definition will furthermore affect the concept of self-control (*σωφροσύνη*): self-control that comes from the knowledge of the soul will cause a person to devote his attention to the "care for one's soul" (*ἐπιμέλεια τῆς ψυχῆς*)[10] instead of to external matters. Based upon these presuppositions, Socrates goes on

[4] Courcelle, 1:20 ff., 30 ff.

[5] According to the edition by J. Burnet, *Platonis Opera*, vol. 2 (1901; reprint ed., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964). Translations are mine.

[6] *Alc.* 1.129e: *Ἕτερον ἄρα ἀνθρωπός ἐστι τοῦ σώματος τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ.*

[7] Ibid.: *Τί ποτ' οὖν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.*

[8] Ibid. 130c: . . . *ἡ ψυχή ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος.*

[9] Ibid. 130e: *Ψυχὴν ἄρα ἡμᾶς κελεύει γνωρίσαι ὁ ἐπιτάττων γνῶναι ἑαυτόν.*

[10] Ibid. 132b–c.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

to raise the question of how we can obtain that kind of knowledge of ourselves. In order to explain the way to it, he turns to the example of the vision of the eyes (132D). Certainly with definite purposes in mind he modifies the maxim and has this instruction given to the eye: "See yourself." How can this happen? Is there a possible way for the eye to see itself? Socrates refers to the observable fact that "the face of the person who looks into someone else's eye is shown by vision of the opposite person, as in a mirror. We of course call it the pupil, a kind of image [*εἴδωλον*] of the person looking."[11] Hence we can say that "an eye beholding another eye and, looking into what is its most precious part and that by which [the other] sees, may in this way see itself."[12]

Socrates then applies this insight to the problem of the knowledge of the soul: ". . . if a soul is to know itself it must look into a soul, and especially into that area of it in which occurs the virtue of the soul, wisdom. . . ."[13] This part which houses "insight and thought" is its most divine. Since it resembles the deity, "anyone looking into this part and knowing all that is divine, the deity as well as thinking, thus may also, in the best possible way, know himself."[14] Once the equation of the self with the soul and the deity was made, another equation offered itself almost necessarily. The older concept of the soul as daimon (*δαίμων* or *δαιμόνιον*)[15] had become highly important in the Socratic and Platonic traditions of thought, especially because of its connection with the so-called *daimonion* of Socrates.[16] This concept of the "personal daimon" which the deity has imparted to every human being is mentioned also in Plato's myths, but it is certainly older than

[11] Ibid. 132e–133a: *Ἐννενόηκας οὖν ὅτι τοῦ ἐμβλέποντος εἰς τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμφαίνεται ἐν τῇ τοῦ καταντικρὺ ὄψει ὥσπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ, ὃ δὴ καὶ κόρην καλοῦμεν, εἴδωλον ὄν τι τοῦ ἐμβλέποντος; . . .*

[12] Ibid. 133a: *Ὀφθαλμὸς ἄρα ὀφθαλμὸν θεώμενος, καὶ ἐμβλέπων εἰς τοῦτο ὅπερ βέλτιστον αὐτοῦ καὶ ᾧ ὁρᾷ, οὕτως ἂν αὐτὸν ἴδοι.*

[13] Ibid. 133b: *. . . καὶ ψυχὴ εἰ μέλλει γνώσεσθαι αὐτήν, εἰς ψυχὴν αὐτῇ βλεπτέον, καὶ μάλιστ' εἰς τοῦτον αὐτῆς τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ ἐγγίγνεται ἡ ψυχῆς ἀρετή, σοφίας.* For the interpretation of this statement in the philosophical tradition, see Courcelle, 1:30 ff.

[14] Ibid. 133c: *Τῷ θεῷ ἄρα τοῦτ' ἔοικεν αὐτῆς, καί τις εἰς τοῦτο βλέπων καὶ πᾶν τὸ θεῖον γνούς, θεόν τε καὶ φρόνησιν, οὕτω καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἂν γνοίη μάλιστα.*

[15] For a general discussion, see C. Colpe et al., "Geister (Dämonen)," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, vol. 10 (1978) (hereafter cited as *RAC*), cols. 546–797, esp. 598 ff., 615 ff.

[16] Ibid. cols. 613–14. See also A. Corlu, *Plutarque, Le démon de Socrate* (Paris: Klincksieck, 1970), pp. 47 ff.; K. Döring, *Exemplum Socratis* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1979), pp. 11–12.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Plato.[17] In the myth of Er we are told that in its preexistent state every soul elects its own daimon as a guide through this life and the hereafter.[18] As one might expect, in the course of the development of Platonic philosophy in later periods the question was extensively discussed whether or not this "personal daimon" was simply to be identified with the self and the soul. As Courcelle[19] has shown, it is in Cicero's sources in his *De legibus*, especially in the *Somnium Scipionis*,[20] and in the *Tusculanae Disputationes* that we find the equation of the divine part of the soul with the "personal daimon."[21]

As a result of this identity it was only a natural further step to approach that daimon as one would approach an oracle for consultation. Self-knowledge, therefore, instead of being the outcome of philosophical self-examination, was interpreted in analogy to the oracular inquiry and reply. Precisely when this change occurred is difficult to determine, but the oracular interpretation was known at least to Epictetus, without his having necessarily discovered it.[22] In *Diss.* III.22.53, Arrian has preserved an interesting set of four parallel maxims from Epictetus, all variations on the Delphic maxim:[23]

> Βούλευσαι ἐπιμελέστερον,
> γνῶθι σαυτόν,
> ἀνάκρινον τὸ δαιμόνιον,
> δίχα θεοῦ μὴ ἐπιχειρήσῃς.
>
> Take council very carefully,
> know yourself,
> consult your personal daimon,
> without God undertake nothing.

[17] See Plato *Leg.* 5.732C, 877A; *Ti.* 90A. For the pre-Platonic concept, see J. ter Vrugt-Lentz, *RAC* 10, cols. 605–6.

[18] See Plato *Resp.* 10.617C, 620D–E; for a different interpretation, see Plato *Phd.* 107D, 108B, 113D.

[19] Courcelle, pp. 29 ff.; see also Betz, pp. 474 ff.

[20] See esp. the summary exhortation in Cicero *Rep.* 6.24.26: "Strive on indeed, and be sure that it is not you that is mortal, but only your body. For that man whom your outward form reveals is not yourself; the spirit is the true self, not that physical figure which can be pointed out by the finger. Know, then, that you are a god, if a god is that which lives, feels, remembers, and foresees, and which rules, governs, and moves the body over which it is set, just as the supreme God above us rules this universe" (trans. C. W. Keyes for the Loeb Classical Library [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1928], pp. 279–81). For a discussion, see P. Boyancé, *Etudes sur le songe de Scipion* (Bordeaux and Paris: Feret & Fils, 1936), pp. 121–37, and K. Büchner, *Somnium Scipionis. Quellen, Gestalt, Sinn* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1976), pp. 88–95.

[21] Courcelle, pp. 32–33.

[22] See, on this problem, A. Bonhöffer, *Epictet und die Stoa* (Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke Verlag, 1890), pp. 81–86; C. Zintzen, *RAC* 10, cols. 640 ff.

[23] The text is quoted from the edition by H. Schenkl, *Epictetus, Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1965), p. 303. The translation is mine.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The set is composed with considerable care. While the first line corresponds to the fourth, and the second to the third (a-b-b-a), the content of the first is more general and propaedeutic in kind, while the fourth line is its fulfillment. These two lines also provide the frame for the second and third lines, with the second containing the root maxim, the Delphic precept, and the third explaining the way for obtaining self-knowledge. The sequence as a whole should be understood as functioning climactically: line 1 begins with the propaedeutic, line 2 introduces the authoritative precept, line 3 is its implementation, and line 4 reveals the ultimate goal of the process. The matter of interest to us is the mantic language of line 3: ἀνακρίνειν is used here in the sense of a mantic technical term,[24] explaining that self-knowledge can be obtained by some kind of consultation of the "personal daimon."

Epictetus, of course, takes this language in the metaphorical sense, since for him such consultation can only mean the careful examination of his "conscience."[25]

THE INTERPRETATION BY THE MAGICIANS

In a different frame of reference, however, the magicians will interpret mantic language on their own terms. For them, therefore, "consult your personal daimon" implies that the Delphic maxim orders them to conjure up their personal daimon and get control of it by magical procedures; when that daimon appears, the magician can then submit questions and receive answers. This type of interpretation and procedure is what we find in the *PGM*.[26]

In *PGM* VII.505–28 a spell is transmitted which bears the title "Meeting with your personal daimon" (σύστασις ἰδίου δαίμονος). At first sight this section title seems misplaced,[27] or the spell seems incomplete,[28] because the matter of meeting

[24] Cf. also the use of the term in *Diss.* 1.1.20, 2.20.27; ἀνάκρισις in *PGM* IV. 1992, 2008, 2140.

[25] See *Diss.* 1.14.12–14; *Enchiridion* 32.

[26] For these demonological doctrines, see esp. Theodor Hopfner, *Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber I* (Leipzig: H. Haessel, 1921), pp. 27–30, secs. 117–34; Colpe et al., cols. 615 ff.

[27] The title is correct textually, as E. R. Dodds points out in *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957), p. 304, n. 56.

[28] See Dodds, p. 289.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

with one's "personal daimon" is never mentioned again. The first part (lines 505–21) contains greetings of Tyche and other deities (505–7), followed by the greeting of Helios-Aion (50–7 8) and his invocation (508–21); the second part (lines 521–28) consists of a brief ritual of purification.

Despite the seeming discrepancy between the title and the content, the spell may nevertheless be correctly entitled. We know especially from Plato's myth of Er[29] that the "personal daimon" had from the beginning a close relationship to "the spindle of Necessity" and to the Moirai, Necessity's three daughters Lachesis, Clotho, and Atropos:

> "But when, to conclude, all the souls had chosen their lives in the order of their lots, they were marshalled and went before Lachesis. And she sent with each, as the guardian of his life and the fulfiller of his choice, the genius that he had chosen, and this divinity led the soul first to Clotho, under her hand and her turning of the spindle to ratify the destiny of his lot and choice; and after contact with her the genius led the soul to the spinning of Atropos to make the web of its destiny irreversible, and then without a backward look it passed beneath the throne of Necessity."[30]

It is not difficult to understand, therefore, why the magician saw an advantage in greeting Tyche first. While the rule of Tyche was an important part of hellenistic beliefs in general, the concept of the "personal daimon" as "fulfiller" (ἀποπληρωτής) of a person's destiny was very much in discussion by the Neoplatonists, as we know from Plotinus, Porphyry, Jamblichus, and Proclus.[31] In addition, there are at least two other points where contacts between the spell of VII.505–28 and the conjuration of the "personal daimon" are suggested.

While in line 506 "the daimon of this place" is greeted, a typical magical reference to locality occurs in the legend reported by Porphyry in his *Vita Plotini* 10. As he tells it, a certain Egyptian magician who had come to Rome and had made the acquaintance of Plotinus offered, as a way to demonstrate his magical skills and powers, to conjure up Plotinus'

[29] Plato, *Resp.* 10.616c–617c.

[30] Ibid., 620d–e, according to the translation by Paul Shorey in the Loeb Classical Library edition of Plato (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1970), 6:517. The critical words read in the Greek: *ἐκείνην δ' ἑκάστῳ, ὃν εἵλατο δαίμονα, τοῦτον φύλακα ξυμπέμπειν τοῦ βίου καὶ ἀποπληρωτὴν τῶν αἱρεθέντων.*

[31] Plotinus *Enn.* 3.4; Jamblichus, *De mysteriis* 10; Proclus, *In Alc.* 77–78; see also Epictetus 1.1.14, 4.1.109. For a survey of the problem, see C. Zintzen, *RAC*, vol. 10, cols. 644–68. For the association of Tyche and Moirai, see also *PGM* XII.254–55, XIII.781–82, and XXI.16, but Tyche and Moirai are usually not identical.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

"personal daimon" (οἰκεῖος δαίμων).[32] In this seance the locality is said to have been of special importance: ". . . the evocation took place in the temple of Isis: the Egyptian said it was the only pure spot [τόπος καθαρός] he could find in Rome."[33] The other point of contact occurs in the same legend in Porphyry.

When Plotinus' "personal daimon" to everyone else's but his own surprise turned out to be not a lower daimon but a god (θεός),[34] the demonstration was unfortunately interrupted before any questions could be addressed to it: "It was not however possible to ask any questions of the god or even to see him present for longer, as the friend who was taking part in the manifestation strangled the birds which he was holding as a protection, either out of jealousy or because he was afraid of something."[35] In *PGM* VII.521–28 we also have a ritual involving not two birds[36] but two eggs with which the magician is advised to purify himself, no doubt for the reason of protection.

An earlier section of the same papyrus contains an invocation of the god Eros, which, although of Greek provenance, now stands in the middle of Graeco-Egyptian materials (VII.478–90). The section has no title, but the content is clearly an incubation ritual and request for a dream revelation.[37] There

[32] The story which has been frequently discussed in recent literature is part of a string of legendary anecdotes popularizing Plotinus's philosophy. See esp. S. Eitrem, "La Théurgie chez les Néo-platoniciens et dans les papyrus magiques," *Symbolae Osloenses* 22 (1942): 49–79, esp. 62 ff.; Dodds, pp. 289–91. The rather apologetic section in Dodds led to the controversy between P. Merlan and A. H. Armstrong on the question of whether Plotinus was a practicing magician or not: see P. Merlan, "Plotinus and Magic," *Isis* 44 (1953): 341–48; "Plotinus and Magic," in *Kleine philosophische Schriften* (Hildesheim and New York: Olms Presse, 1976), pp. 388–95; A. H. Armstrong, "Was Plotinus a Magician?" *Phronesis* 1 (1955): 73–79; and J. M. Rist, "Plotinus and the *Daimonion* of Socrates," *Phoenix* 17 (1963): 13–24.

[33] Porphyry, *Plot.* 10, according to the translation by A. H. Armstrong in the Loeb Classical Library edition of Plotinus (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966), 1:33–35.

[34] This surprising event is not, however, inconsistent with Plotinus's own much more subtle views stated in *Enneads* 3.4. See also J. Haussleiter, "Deus internus," *RAC*, vol. 3 (1955), cols. 794–842, esp. 808 ff.; W. Himmerich, *Eudaimonia. Die Lehre des Plotin von der Selbstverwirklichung des Menschen* (Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1959); H. J. Blumenthal, *Plotinus' Psychology: His Doctrines of the Embodied Soul* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1971); C. de Vogel, "Plotinus' Image of Man: Its Relationship to Plato as Well as to Later Neoplatonism," in *Images of Man in Ancient and Medieval Thought. Studia G. Verbeke . . . dicata* (Louvain: Catholic University Press, 1976), pp. 147–68.

[35] Plotinus 1:35 (see above, n. 33).

[36] How these birds could have acted as protection is far from clear, as was pointed out by Eitrem (see n. 32 above), pp. 62 ff.; and Dodds, pp. 290–91.

[37] At the beginning, after the address to the god, the papyrus has an unidentifiable word which could be, as Preisendanz suggests, an abbreviation of a section title ὀνειραίτητον ("request for a dream revelation").

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

are four sections: the invocation of Eros (lines 478–83), followed by instructions for a burnt-offering (484–86), a phylactery (486–88), and the incubation (488–91).

The request to Eros is "to send me my personal daimon tonight, to give me information about whatever the concern is" (line 478). The word "daimon" is missing in the papyrus, but must be restored if the spell is to make any sense.[38] Two hints in the spell suggest that it has to do with the consultation of the "personal daimon." The burnt offering has among the ingredients to be burnt "dirt from your sandal"—an instance of magical substance (*οὐσία*) representing the person's self.[39] In addition, the instruction for the incubation says somewhat ambiguously (line 489): *εἴσελθε παρὰ σεαυτῷ*, which can be rendered in the ordinary sense as "go to [a room] by yourself,"[40] or, with a deeper sense implied, as "turn in with yourself." The ordinary sense is indicated by the following instruction to "put out the lamp and sleep on a rush mat on a new bedstead." However, a magician acquainted with the Hermetic or Neoplatonic interpretation of the Delphic precept as "migration" or "return into your self" might have seen a reference to this in the magical text. In sleep the body and its sense perceptions would be understood as put at rest, so that the soul can separate from the body and return to its eternal and divine state of being.[41]

The question of how the "personal daimon" can be recognized once it appears is answered by two other *PGM* sections, both of which reflect older Egyptian and Greek ideas.

A badly damaged spell for gaining control of one's own shadow, *PGM* III.612–32, is Egyptian in provenance. The magician is assured that as a result of a prescribed ritual "you will gain control of your own shadow, so that it will serve you."[42] The shadow of a human person had been identified

[38] The restoration of *δαίμονα* is more likely than *ἄγγελον* as Preisendanz has it, since the technical term *ἴδιος δαίμων* occurs in the same papyrus (*PGM* VII.505).

[39] See *PGM* VII.484. For this magical use of dirt, see Hopfner, pp. 171–72 (secs. 669–77). The concept reflects popular religion, as some New Testament passages show (Mark 6:11; Matt. 10:14; Luke 9:5, 10:11; Acts 13:51, 18:6). For the significance of the sandal in magic, see the material referred to in Hans Dieter Betz, "Fragments from a Catabasis Ritual in a Greek Magical Papyrus," *History of Religions* 19 (1980):287–95.

[40] Preisendanz II, p. 22 translates: "geh heim."

[41] See Betz, "The Delphic Maxim," pp. 468–69, 478 ff.; Courcelle, p. 75, n. 32; p. 110, n. 52; also W. Theiler, "Antike und christliche Rückkehr zu Gott," in his *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1966), pp. 313–25.

[42] *PGM* III.614–15; see also 623–24, 629–30. I am indebted to John Dillon for the translation.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

with his soul in popular religion[43] since the archaic times of Egyptian[44] as well as Greek religion,[45] and in particular its role in magic is well attested in the sources.[46] There is, however, only this one passage in the *PGM*.

When the shadow appears, the magician is told, "it will come to you standing opposite you, and then say to it: 'Follow me everywhere' . . ." (lines 630–32). In other words, control of the self has been achieved when the magician's shadow has become his "assistant daimon" (*πάρεδρος δαίμων*).[47]

The other spell important for the concept of the "personal daimon" is *PGM* VIII.1–52, entitled "Love spell of Astrapsoukos" (*φιλτροκατάδεσμος Ἀστραψούκου*).[48] The spell itself is, however, not concerned with gaining the love of a woman or a man, as one would expect, but with obtaining in a more general sense "favor, sustenance, victory, prosperity, elegance, beauty of face, strength among all men and women" (lines 4–6). The character of the spell is Graeco-Egyptian with possible influences from Neoplatonic concepts.[49] The greater part of the rather involved text consists of a lengthy invocation of Hermes, who is said to be manifest not only in four mystical names at the four quarters of heaven but also in the four sacred animals of ibis, dog-faced baboon, serpent, and wolf, representing the deities Thoth, Anubis, Uto, and another form of Anubis (lines

[43] See F. Pradel, "Der Schatten im Volksglauben," *Mitteilungen der Schlesischen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde* 12 (1904): 1–36; J. von Negelein, "Bild, Spiegel und Schatten im Volksglauben," *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 5 (1902): 1–37 (hereafter cited as *ARW*); M. Bieler, "Schatten," *Handwörterbuch des Deutschen Aberglaubens* 9 (1940): 126–42.

[44] See B. George, *Zu den altägyptischen Vorstellungen vom Schatten als Seele* (Bonn: Rudolf Habelt Verlag, 1970).

[45] See E. Rohde, *Psyche*, 2 vols. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961), 1:3 ff.; H. D. Betz, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), pp. 85, 93, 151; P. W. van der Horst, "Der Schatten im hellenistischen Volksglauben," in *Studies in Hellenistic Religions*, ed. M. J. Vermaseren (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1979), pp. 27–36.

[46] See esp. Plutarch *De Is. et Os.* 47, 370C; *Quaest. Graec.* 39, 300C; *De sera* 24, 564C–D; and Pliny *HN* 28.69. For a discussion, see Hopfner, pp. 53, 82, 84 (secs. 222, 333, 347); J. G. Griffiths, *Plutarch, De Iside et Osiride* (Cambridge: University of Wales Press, 1970), pp. 481–82.

[47] This type of daimon occurs often in the *PGM* (e.g., I.42–54, I.96–130, I.186–92; IV.1840–70; XII.14–16). See K. Preisendanz, "Paredros, 2" *Reallexikon der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, vol. 18 (1949) (hereafter cited as *PW*), cols. 1428–53; *RAC* 10, cols. 621–22.

[48] Apparently meant to refer to the legendary Persian magician Astrampsychos. See E. Riess, "Astrampsychos," *PW*, vol. 2 (1896), cols. 1796–97.

[49] The terms *ἀλκή* ("strength"), in lines 6 and 31, *συνοχή* ("distress") in line 35, *εἴδωλον* ("image") in line 38, and *συνρέπω* ("incline together" [?]) in line 51 are of interest to Neoplatonism. See O. Geudtner, *Die Seelenlehre der Chaldäischen Orakel* (Meisenheim: Anton Hain Verlag, 1971), pp. 48, 50 ff.; H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy*, new ed., by M. Tardieu (Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1978)

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

6–11).[50] Moreover, Hermes is identified by his plant and his tree (lines 12–13) and his city of Hermopolis (14). These and other identifications made in the spell justify addressing Hermes as the "many-named" (πολυώνυμος) (line 14).

What then is the relationship between the god Hermes and the "personal daimon"? Clearly, Hermes is invoked as the highest god and is requested: "Hear me and make me agreeable to all the species throughout the inhabited world. Open up for me hands of everyone who dispenses gifts and compel them to give me what they have in their hands" (lines 16–20).[51] While this language sounds fairly traditional, the magician goes on to state the special powers that he claims to have over the god because of his mystical union with him. Expressing these claims, the magician draws on a number of mystical formulae. To begin with, he recites a threefold petition for mystical union with the god: "Come to me, lord Hermes, as fetuses do to wombs of women. Come to me, lord Hermes, who collect the assemblies of gods and men. Come to me NN, lord Hermes, and give me . . ." (lines 2–4). To judge from the following sections, however, it seems that the mystical union with the god has already taken place (perhaps in the initiation of the magician in which the secret names of the god used in the spell were first revealed to him). As a result of this union the magician may have thought to have the god under control, or to be controlled by the god and therefore express his will with his power. Three formulae express this union, the first two of which are in lines 36–37:

> σὺ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἐγὼ σύ,
> τὸ σὸν ὄνομα ἐμὸν καὶ τὸ ἐμὸν σόν.
>
> For you are I, and I am you;
> your name is mine, and mine is yours.

While the first formula is attested also elsewhere in the *PGM*[52] and, in fact, is known from gnostic and mystic texts outside this literature as well,[53] and the second is characteristic of

[50] For this information I am indebted to Jan Bergman.
[51] The translation quoted here is by Edward N. O'Neil.
[52] E.g., in line 50; see *PGM* XIII.795 and its context.
[53] See O. Weinreich, "Religiöse Stimmen der Völker," *ARW* 19 (1916–19): 165–68; F. Heiler, *Das Gebet*, 4th ed. (Munich: Ernst Reinhardt Verlag, 1922), pp. 306–7; R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1904), pp. 20–21, 242 ff.; A. Dieterich, *Eine Mithrasliturgie*, 3d ed. (Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1923), pp. 97–98, 240; G. Widengren, *Religionsphänomenologie* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1969), pp. 516–45.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

magic, a third formula is unique in the *PGM*[54] (lines 37–38):

ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι τὸ εἴδωλόν σου.

For I am your image.

This statement is certainly more than an incidental confession; it is a self-definition of the status of the magician in the hierarchy of beings and, moreover, a definition of the human self.

The statement has been interpreted in various ways. R. Reitzenstein assumed Egyptian ideas to lie behind the notion of *eidolon* and identified it with the *ka*.[55] F. Preisigke thought of it in terms of a divine fluidum: "Like the fluidum of a god flows into his statue, in order to take its effect there as the living divine I, so it also flows into the body of the initiate."[56] But the notion of *eidolon* seems to be Greek in origin.

The concept of "image" (εἴδωλον) as referring to the soul is old in Greek religion. It describes the soul as a visible entity which can even be depicted in vase paintings.[57] Philosophical speculation also adopted the term and interpreted it in a variety of ways. Such speculations determined that the substance of such "images" must be a kind of "spirit" (πνεῦμα).[58] The philosophers also used the concept in explaining the relationship between the soul and the deity.[59] According to traditions handed down in the Academy[60] and elaborated further in

[54] Cf., however, XII.235–36, LXI.53–55; and the Book of Jeu, chaps. 39, 41, etc. (see V. MacDermott, *The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex* [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978], p. 329, s.v. εἰκών).

[55] R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres*, p. 21, n. 11.

[56] F. Preisigke, *Vom göttlichen Fluidum nach ägyptischer Anschauung* (Berlin and Leipzig: Vereinigung wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1920), pp. 18–19. My own translation.

[57] See O. Waser, "Über die äussere Erscheinung der Seele in den Vorstellungen der Völker, zumal der alten Griechen," *ARW* 16 (1913): 336–88, esp. 360 ff.

[58] See F. Rüsche, *Das Seelenpneuma, seine Entwicklung von der Hauchseele zur Geistseele, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der antiken Pneumalehre* (1933; reprint ed., New York: Johnson Publishing Co., 1968); H. Kleinknecht, "πνεῦμα," *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (1959; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1968), 6:332–59.

[59] See also W. Burkert, "Air-Imprints or Eidola: Democritus' Aetiology of Vision," *Illinois Classical Studies* 2 (1977): 97–109.

[60] This doctrine of the εἴδωλον (Latin: *simulacrum*) appears to be middle Platonic. See Plutarch *De E apud Delphos* 21.393E, reflecting source material; see H. D. Betz, "Observations on Some Gnosticizing Passages in Plutarch," in *Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, Filologisk-filosofiska serien*, no. 17 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1977), pp. 169–78, esp. 175–77; I. Heinemann, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften*, 2 vols. (Breslau: Marcus, 1921, 1928), 1:55 ff.; 2:312 ff.

This content downloaded from 130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

hermetic[61] and Neoplatonic[62] speculations, the unity and difference between the soul and the deity is explained by the analogy of the mirror picture: the soul as the divine self in the human being reflects, as a mirror reflects the deity, so that whoever looks into the human soul by introspection sees the deity.[63] This concept stands also behind the magician's confession in *PGM* VIII.37–38. When one sees such an "image," one can look into it as into a mirror and conclude by way of knowledge that what one sees in the mirror is the god himself. Applied to *PGM* VIII.37–38, this means that the magician himself (that is, his self) is the mirror-picture of the god Hermes. If this interpretation is correct, the analogous one in the Hymn of Christ in the *Acts of Thomas* comes to mind, where Christ says of himself:[64]

> ἔσοπτρόν εἰμί σοι τῷ νοοῦντί με.
>
> A mirror I am to you who know me.

Furthermore, the statement calls to mind New Testament passages, like the Fourth Gospel defining the relationship between the Father and the Son in this way: "He who has seen me has seen the Father."[65] To be sure, this concept did not originate in the New Testament but seems to be older.[66] At any rate, in Hermetic and Neoplatonic thought it became the central concept for determining the relationship between the

[61] *Corpus Hermeticum* VI.4; *Fragments* VIII.3; XI.2 (47); XV.4. For the interpretation of the concept in gnosticism, see G. Quispel, "Das ewige Ebenbild des Menschen. Zur Begegnung mit dem Selbst in der Gnosis," in his *Gnostic Studies* (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Instituut in het Nabije Oosten, 1974), 1:140–57.

[62] See Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, index s.v. εἴδωλον; J. H. Sleeman and G. Pollet, *Lexicon Plotinianum* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1980), cols. 299–30 s.v. εἴδωλον.

[63] See H. Leisegang, "La Connaissance de Dieu au miroir de l'âme et de la nature," *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 17 (1937): 145–71; J. Geffcken, "Der Bilderstreit des heidnischen Altertums," *ARW* 19 (1916–19): 286–315, esp. 304 ff.; G. B. Ladner, "Eikon," *RAC*, vol. 4 (1959), cols. 771–86.

[64] *Acta Joannis* 95 (25), ed. R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1959), 2, pt. 1:198. Cf. differently Odes of Solomon 13:1 (J. J. Charlesworth, ed., *The Odes of Solomon* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973]): "Behold, the Lord is our mirroir. Open (your) eyes and see them in Him." See also Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies* 13.16.2.

[65] John 14:9 and the context 14:7–11 (see R. Bultmann, *The Gospel of John* [Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971], p. 605, n. 6, referring to the "personal daimon" in Jamblichus *De mysteriis* 9:6; 5:19, 6:46, 10:30, 17:1 ff.). See also M. Smith, *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), pp. 226–27.

[66] The corresponding concept in the New Testament is εἰκών, while εἴδωλον is reserved for "idol."

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

self and the deity. If, therefore, the magician in *PGM* VIII.37–38 defines himself in his relationship to the deity by the formula "I am your image," we can conclude that he was influenced by the philosophical tradition, which had taken up and interpreted the ancient and widespread religious notion of the relation of man to God as his "image," found already in Gen. 1:26 ff.

In addition to accepting Hermetic or Neoplatonic language, however, the magician also provides his own interpretation. While the first formula ("you are I and I am you") comes from a mystical and even erotic background, and the last ("I am your image") from Hellenistic philosophical thought, the middle one gives the magical rationale: "your name is mine and mine is yours." Characteristic for the magical literature, it is the knowledge of the secret name that establishes the ground for the mystical union.

In *PGM* VIII.40–49 the magician reminds Hermes that he knows his "true name" from the holy stele in the innermost sanctuary of the temple in Hermopolis, where Hermes was born. That name is then stated and the inherent powers are released. On this basis the magician can claim (lines 49–50):

> οἶδά σε, Ἑρμῆ, καὶ σὺ ἐμέ·
> ἐγώ εἰ⟨μι⟩ σὺ καὶ σὺ ἐγώ.
>
> I know you, Hermes, and you me;
> I am you, and you are I.

Hence knowledge of the god through knowledge of the names is the same as knowledge of the magician's self—this is the magician's answer to the Delphic maxim. Possessing this knowledge, the magician can then also use his powers to influence his destiny. Whatever that destiny may have been before, now it is identical with the god's own destiny (lines 38–40): "If something should happen to me during this year or this month or this day or this hour, it will happen to the great god . . ." But Hermes is a good god, the great benefactor of gods and men, as the magician frequently reminds him. United with this god, the magician's own destiny can therefore be nothing but good, too. When he finally presents his request to the god, therefore, he does so by supplementing the traditional request formula with his own interpretation. Traditional is the opening line, interpretative the second, traditional again the conclusion (lines 50–52):

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

καὶ πρᾶξόν μοι πάντα
καὶ συνρέπ⟨ο⟩ις σὺν Ἀγαθῇ Τύχῃ καὶ Ἀγαθῷ Δαίμονι,
ἤδη, ἤδη, ταχύ, ταχύ.

And so, do everything for me,
and may you turn to me with Good Fortune and Good Daimon,
quickly, quickly, immediately, immediately.

Having a beneficent god like Hermes as his "personal daimon" can only mean that the god will "incline together"[67] with Good Daimon and, as the "fulfiller of destiny," with Good Fortune, both prominent deities in the *PGM* and, for that matter, in Graeco-Roman religions in general.[68]

Once these self-identifications have been recognized in their nature and purpose, other such statements in the *PGM* fall into place. All of them document the identity of the knowledge of the divine and the knowledge of the self as understood by the magicians.

In *PGM* III.599–600, in the context of a long Hermetic prayer of thanksgiving, the magician states the indebtedness of his community for the knowledge of god:

χαίρομ[ε]ν, ὅτι σεαυτὸν ἡμῖν ἔδειξας,
χαίρομεν, ὅτι ἐν πλάσμασιν ἡμᾶς ὄντας ἀπεθέωσας τῇ σεαυτοῦ γνώσει.

We rejoice that you have shown yourself to us;
we rejoice that while being in bodies you have
deified us by the knowledge of yourself.[69]

Another such self-presentation is found in a long invocation of Apollo in *PGM* II.126–28:

ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ δεῖνα, ὅστις σοι ἀπήντησα,
καὶ δῶρόν μοι ἐδωρήσω τὴν τοῦ μεγίστου σου ὀνόματος γνῶσιν, . . .

I am NN, who have come into your presence
and you have given me as a gift the knowledge of
your most great name . . .[70]

This knowledge of the deity has its counterpart in statements of self-knowledge. A short statement of this kind occurs in an invocation to the god Aion in *PGM* IV.1177–80:

ἐγώ εἰμι ἄνθρωπος, θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ πλάσμα κάλλιστον,
γενόμενον ἐκ πνεύματος καὶ δρόσου καὶ γῆς.

I am a human being, the heavenly deity's most
beautiful creation,
made out of spirit and dew and earth.[71]

[67] The translation of *συνρέπω* in line 51 is uncertain; see n. 49 above.
[68] See also *PGM* IV.2999–3000. On *Agathos Daimon*, see Colpe, *RAC*, vol. 8 (1972), cols. 182–97.
[69] Translation by W. C. Grese. See also lines 570 ff., 578, 605, 607–8.
[70] Translation by J. Dillon.
[71] My own translation.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

The extraordinary similarity of this statement and those found on the so-called *Orphic Tablets*[72] is obvious and suggests that the papyrus quotes older material; in fact, a "gold tablet" is even mentioned in line 1219.

A much more elaborate self-presentation occurs in the great invocation of Helios in the so-called "Mithras Liturgy," *PGM* IV.644–49:

> ἄνθρωπος ἐγὼ ὁ δεῖνα τῆς δεῖνα,
> γενόμενος ἐκ θνητῆς ὑστέρας τῆς δεῖνα καὶ ἰχῶρος σπερματικοῦ,
> καὶ σήμερον τούτου ὑπό σου με⟨τα⟩γεννηθέντος,
> ἐκ τοσούτων μυριάδων ἀπαθανατισθεὶς
> ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ κατὰ δόκησιν θεοῦ ὑπερβαλλόντως ἀγαθοῦ,[73] . . .
>
> A human being am I, NN, son of her, NN,
> born from the mortal womb of NN and from the seminal fluid,
> and today, when this man has been rebegotten by you;
> having become immortal, out of so many thousands
> in this hour according to the will of a god abundantly good, . . ."[74]

Comparison of this self-presentation with the shorter one in *PGM* IV.1177–80 shows that a simpler statement of two lines has been expanded to include the person's regeneration, which is the result of having been initiated into the mystery of the "Mithras Liturgy."[75]

CONCLUSION

The *PGM* demonstrate that such self-presentations[76] were part of rituals of deification, such as is the "Mithras Liturgy."

[72] See *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, ed. O. Kern (Berlin: Weidmann, 1922), no. 32 (pp. 104–9), and the edition with commentary by G. Zuntz, *Persephone* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), pp. 275 ff. Type B contains a line (line 6) which is to be cited as a "password": Γῆς παῖς εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος ("A child of the Earth I am and of starry Heaven"). See Zuntz's commentary, pp. 364 ff. A similar statement is found in the new gold tablet from Hipponion, line 11: Τὸς Βαρέας καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος ("A son of Heavy [sc. Earth] I am and of starry Heaven"). For commentaries on the Hipponion tablet, see R. Merkelbach, "Bakchisches Goldtäfelchen aus Hipponion," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 17 (1975): 8–9; M. L. West, "Zum neuen Goldblättchen aus Hipponion," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 18 (1975): 226–36; M. Marcovich, "The Gold Leaf from Hipponion," *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 23 (1976): 221–24; G. Zuntz, "Die Goldlamelle von Hipponion," *Wiener Studien*, N.F. 10 (1976): 129–51. There is a similar line in the tablet in the J. P. Getty Museum in Malibu, California, which reads (lines 4–5): Γᾶς υἱός εἰμι καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος ("A son of Earth I am and of starry Heaven"). See the edition by J. Breslin, *A Greek Prayer* (Pasadena, Calif.: Ambassador College, n.d.).

[73] My punctuation differs somewhat from that of Preisendanz. For the formula see also lines 516–37.

[74] My own translation.

[75] See *PGM*, lines 718–27; also 476–77, 501, 516–37; and for the interpretation see Dieterich, *Mithrasliturgie*, pp. 134 ff. See also the important passage in Pseudo-Plato *Axiochus* 372a.

[76] See also *PGM* III.145–46, XIII.637.

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

In this frame of reference which extends to all of the magical texts, self-knowledge and self-control are no longer regarded as a matter of philosophical self-examination or moral exercise but as the outcome of magical initiation. This is the magicians' answer to the Delphic maxim "Know yourself," an answer not as commonly known as the interpretations of the philosophical tradition. But it may have been just as influential in the history of religion and literature, being transmitted, as befits magic, through literary underground channels.

To cite one of the most impressive examples, in the opening monologue of Goethe's *Faust*, Faust is shown reflecting on the implications of the Socratic dictum that all we know is that we know nothing, itself part of the tradition of the Delphic maxim (line 364). Because of these miserable results from scholarship Faust has turned to magic (line 377). Guided by a book of the great Nostradamus, Faust approaches the great Spirit and is just about to experience an ecstatic ascent into the higher world when Wagner, his famulus, "der trockne Schleicher" (line 520), interrupts the experience. When Wagner has left the room, Faust continues the monologue and presents himself with these words (lines 614–22):[77]

> "Ich, Ebenbild der Gottheit, das sich schon
> Ganz nah gedünkt dem Spiegel ew'ger Wahrheit,
> Sein selbst genoß in Himmelsglanz und Klarheit,
> Und abgestreift den Erdensohn;
> Ich, mehr als Cherub, dessen freie Kraft
> Schon durch die Adern der Natur zu fließen
> Und, schaffend, Götterleben zu genießen
> Sich ahnungsvoll vermaß, wie muß ich's büßen!
> Ein Donnerwort hat mich hinweggerafft."

University of Chicago

[77] *Goethe's Werke*, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Großherzogin Sophie von Sachsen (Weimar: Böhlau-Verlag, 1887), 14, pt. 1: 37. For an English version of the quotation see *Goethe's Faust*, Parts I and II, in the Sir Theodore Martin translation, introduced, revised, and annotated by W. H. Bruford (London: Dent; New York: Dutton, 1954), pp. 21–22:

> "I, God's own image, I who deem'd I stood
> With truth eternal full within my gaze,
> And of this earthly husk divested, view'd
> In deep contentment heaven's effulgent blaze;
> I, more than cherub, whose free powers, methought,
> Did all the veins of nature permeate,
> I who—so potently my fancy wrought—
> Conceived that, like a god, I could create,
> And in creating taste a bliss supreme,
> How must I expiate my frenzied dream?
> One word, that smote like thunder on my brain,
> Swept me away to nothingness again."

This content downloaded from
130.212.18.96 on Fri, 26 Sep 2025 23:31:20 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms